Connery Associates

Fiscal Impact Analysis
129 Parker Street
Maynard Massachusetts

February 13, 2006

1.0 Summary of Findings

- The current site has an annual property tax value of $400,000 given prior agreements between the Town and the owner. However, based on recent market studies we find the buildings have essentially no value and the site's tax value is essentially a land value that would generate an annual property tax of approximately $100,000.

- A 200,000 square foot neighborhood retail center anchored by a supermarket with a 25,000 square foot medical/professional office component generates an annual net fiscal benefit of approximately $633,000.

- While we have examined both rental and condominium residential, it should be noted that the Town cannot determine or control the form of ownership.

  Two hundred (200) 40B apartments generate an annual net fiscal loss of approximately $275,000.

  Two Hundred (200) 40B condominiums generate a net annual fiscal benefit of approximately $109,000.

- 100 40B condominiums and 100 assisted living units generate an annual net fiscal benefit of approximately $123,000, assuming a for profit developer for the assisted living units. However, if a non-profit organization developed the assisted living component no revenues to the town would be forthcoming from this component and the annual net fiscal benefit would decline to approximately $55,000.

2.0 Overview

In conjunction with a proposed rezoning of property located at 129 Parker Street, Connery Associates has prepared a fiscal impact analysis for both retail and residential re-use options of the 58 acre former Digital Equipment site in Maynard Massachusetts. As part of this study we also examined the implications of maintaining the status quo. The primary objective of this study is to provide the Town of Maynard (Maynard) with an understanding of the fiscal implications of various re-use options that are consistent with market reality. While Connery Associates is generally familiar with prevailing market conditions, a separate, independent market analysis of the site and region has been prepared by RKG Associates of Durham New Hampshire. The private sector financial values used in this report have been derived from the above noted RKG report to maintain consistency between both reports, while the public financial values reflect current local practices of the assessors department. Finally, FY2005 for operational expenditures has been employed for this study since it represents the most recent completed year of municipal expenses. For purposes of clarity the larger values have been rounded to the nearest $1,000.

.1 Status Quo.

It is our position that the site is a vacant industrial site in the full sense of the term. We believe the existing buildings have a very limited re use potential and that reuse of the site will entail removal of all or most of the existing buildings. Further, the site has been essentially vacant for 10 years and will remain vacant well into the future given current zoning, structural and market conditions. Currently, the site generates no income and is unlikely to generate revenue in the foreseeable future. Accordingly, projecting the status quo into the foreseeable future we believe the taxable or fiscal value of the entire site is essentially the taxable value of the land given the current zoning restrictions. Based on the current commercial tax rate, we estimate that the annual tax revenues of the entire 58 acre site will be approximately $100,000 once adjusted for market realities.

2.2 Reuse Options

The list below summarizes the re-use options to be examined in the order in which they are addressed in the report.

- 200,000 square feet of retail with a supermarket anchor and 25,000 sq. ft. of medical and/or professional office use
- 200 unit residential 40B as a rental development.
- 200 unit residential 40B as a condominium development.
- 100 unit 40b condominium development and a 100 unit assisted living facility.

3.0 Summary of Methodology

The analysis divides *municipal service cost associated with residential use* into two broad categories school costs and general service costs (all other non-school costs). For each cost category an examination of the incremental or as appropriate, per capita, cost was

undertaken. For example, after estimating the number of school aged children that would most likely be generated we developed an incremental cost per new student. Specifically, we examined the cost of instruction (with all associated employment benefits), special education costs, the cost of supplies and materials per student, and anticipated transportation costs. The estimated incremental cost was then applied to the total number of the estimated additional students.

The general service costs were computed on a per capita basis since there is a direct relationship between numbers of people and municipal service demand. However, to determine the total direct and current service cost it was necessary to examine the nature of each development scenario and relate it on department by department basis in order to accommodate the characteristics of each development scenario. Therefore, the method employed is a modification of a formal per capita analysis.

Depending on the scenario tested, if there was a possibility of departmental impact or at least a measurable fiscal impact the service cost item has been included as a cost. Accordingly, full service costs for items like police, fire, dispatching services were included as well as all human service costs such as libraries, recreation, elections, civil defense, and other general service cost items generated by new residents. However, it is anticipated that functions such as internal road maintenance, trash collection, lighting, and snow plowing, will be a private responsibility at the subject site, therefore, we made adjustments and reduced public works cost impacts accordingly. Importantly, there are operational budget line items that we believe will not be impacted by the proposal as a direct and current operational cost unless there is a clearly related increase in staffing levels at specific departments. An obvious example of the latter is the existing employee salary and benefits line item which includes items such as pensions and insurance. Further, we did not add costs relative to general government such as Town Boards and Town Manager since no measurable costs or relationship is apparent nor are staffing increases anticipated as a result of bring the site back on line as a functioning area. Short term staff or consultant needs which may be needed by the building department will easily be addressed by development permit fees.

After determining the projected costs for the impacted departments we applied said value to the estimated population of the proposal to generate the total general service cost. As with the total school costs, we derived an estimated cost per unit for general service costs, and by combining both cost types we arrived at total service cost.

Determination of municipal service cost relative to residential development represents only one part of the fiscal equation. To estimate net fiscal profile we examined the revenue stream to be produced by the proposal. In this instance we employed the full and fair market value approach to determine assessed value since we are proposing a sale product and the income assessment approach for the rental units. We also examined the value of automotive excise taxes and any potential for Chapter 70 foundation school aid.

We combined all revenue sources to determine a gross revenue stream. Relating the total costs to total revenue generates the fiscal profile of the proposal.

To estimate the fiscal implications of the various commercial scenarios we used the proportional valuation method contained in *The Fiscal Impact Handbook by Burchell and Listokin* to estimate the portion of annual operating costs that could be assigned to commercial use. Based on the total existing occupied commercial, industrial, and space in the community we derived an average service cost per foot. To determine revenue for commercial uses we employed the income analysis method and determined local rental values to arrive at total taxable value per commercial scenario.

4.0. Neighborhood Retail Center (200,000 square feet)

Using the proportional valuation method from *The Fiscal Impact Handbook by Burchell and Listokin* we estimate that approximately 7% of the annual municipal service costs are generated by commercial and industrial uses in Maynard. Accordingly, using the FY2005 budget we examined the direct and current service costs for all applicable non-school items and determined that $980,000 in service costs is generated by the approximately 2.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space in the community. Dividing the total service cost by the total commercial / industrial area generates an average service cost per square foot of 39 cents. The large majority of the commercial service cost is associated with traffic management and other police and public safety costs.

The neighborhood retail center scenario assumes a 75,000 square foot supermarket as an anchor store. For the purposes of this study we are assuming an average rent of $20 per foot for the supermarket space. Using the income method with a 5% vacancy rate, a 25% operation and maintenance deduction and a cap rate of 11.4 we derived a total assessed value of $9,210,000, or a taxable value of $123 per square foot. Accordingly the net tax yield using a 23.70 tax rate would be $218,277. Deducting a $29,000 service costs, as described above, yields a net fiscal benefit of $189,277 for the supermarket component.

The remaining 125,000 square feet of retail would most likely have an average rent of $25 per foot (a range of $20 to $30 per foot depending on store type) generating an assessed value of $19,200,000. At said value we can anticipate $455,000 in property taxes. Assuming $49,000 in service costs, the associated retail component generates a net positive fiscal benefit of $406,000

For the medical/professional office component we have assigned an average of $15per foot (for office use the rent could be $10 -15 per foot while for appropriately fitted out medical labs or facilities could easily exceed $20 per foot). At said rate we can anticipate an assessment of approximately $2,000,000 and a tax yield of $47,800. Subtracting the anticipated average service costs of $0.39 per foot yields a net positive benefit of $38,000 per year.

5.0 200 40B Rental Units

Residential reuse could be either conventional residential redevelopment or 40B residential, and further, that the development could be either a rental or condominium development. While we have examined both rental and condominium options it should be noted that the form of development (condominium or rental) is an option of the developer and cannot be determined by the community.

For the purposes of this analysis we have determined that a portion of the site can accommodate 200 units of housing as a 40B development. A 40B of 200 units was selected since it represents the largest individual 40B permitted in a community the size of Maynard outside the local initiative project guidelines. For the purposes of this analysis we have assumed that the project mix is 20% three bedroom, 70 % two bedroom and 10% one bedroom based on a review regional affordable housing needs.

The initial analysis below assumes a rental 40B development, accordingly 25% of all units or a total of 50 units would be as affordable units consistent with the regulations of the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development, as such all 200 rental units would be counted towards the Town of Maynard's affordable housing requirements.

Table 1. 40B Scenario 200 Rental Units

Apartment Type	Number of units
1 bedroom market	15
1 bedroom affordable	5
2 bedroom market	105
2 bedroom affordable	35
3 bedroom market	30
3-bedroom affordable	10
Total	**200**

To estimate the municipal fiscal impact associated with the residential option summarized in Table 1 above we have divided municipal expenditures into two broad categories: one, school expenditures by which is meant the incremental cost of adding new school age children to the public school system; two, non-school costs which represents all other

forms of municipal service costs i.e. public safety, cultural, recreation, and other public services.

5.1 School Enrollment Trends and Education Costs

For Maynard, as in most communities, education is the single most expensive residential municipal service cost. In FY2005, the total school budget for the Maynard Public Schools including the Assabet Valley Vocational School is $12.5 million or approximately $9,000 per pupil for each of the approximately 1,400 students. However, in large measure the cost of adding new students is not an application of the cost per pupil times the number of new students because administrative, physical plant and certain operational costs are rarely impacted. Additional school costs vary from community to community but in general they are a function of the physical capacity / condition of the existing system, local enrollment trends, and the underlying growth rate of the community. If a school system has considerable or moderate physical plant capacity, a stable to slow student enrollment growth pattern, and a low community population growth rate, the incremental cost associated with the addition of new students is usually considerably less than the average per student cost. However, if the overall school system is experiencing rapid enrollment gains, and community wide population growth rates are high and projected to remain high, it is likely that any additional students may generate an increase in staff, redistricting or in some cases additions to the physical plant. However, in this instance we note that Maynard had school enrollment increases up to 2003 but that current levels are lower and reviewing the past ten years the enrollment has been essential level with an average enrollment of about 1,400 students.

For Maynard, state (Executive Office of Environmental Affairs) community build-out studies indicate that while there is single family residential growth potential in the community it is relatively low given current regulations as indicated by the fact that only six new single family home permits were granted in 2004. In this instance, we believe the most salient aspect the state build-out data is the finding that while Maynard does have single family residential growth potential it is not of a magnitude that will significantly alter the residential land use characteristics or generate significant new student populations. Therefore, we anticipate the Maynard enrollment rate will expand at a relatively slow rate and serve a student population of not more than 1,500 students by 2020 given the availability of land and current development regulations. Accordingly, we find that cost of adding new students from a 40B rental scenario is a marginal or incremental cost i.e. a function of new instructors, supplies, special education, and transportation costs. The cost associated with the students generated by the proposal will not impact administrative costs, building operation costs in the short or near term. However, if the additional anticipated students are determined by the School Department to require additional space or be the factor to require a new school then additional capital costs will need to be added on to this cost assessment.

Table 2 below illustrates the values used to estimate the number of school aged children by unit type. The total number of school aged children (SAC) represents an "average year", however, it should be anticipated that the actual number of students may fluctuate on an annual basis by five to ten percent. As part of this report we are submitting a copy of Housing the Commonwealth's School Aged Children prepared in 2003, Appendix 1. The report was prepared for the Citizens Housing and Planning Association (CHAPA) by Judi Barrett of Community Opportunities Group (primary author) and Connery Associates. The report is the most detailed survey of student generation by multi-family housing types in Massachusetts. It should be noted that among its findings building type as well as number of bedrooms were determined to play a significant role in student generation rates. Units with two or less bedrooms per unit were found to generate relatively few school aged children, while three bedroom multi family units generated considerably more school aged children but 20% to 30% less than to a three to four bedroom single family house.

Further, buildings with elevators are clearly attractive to older residents, since the condominium or apartment becomes an essentially one level housing unit. Conversely for cultural, play space, and perceived child safety issues; people with school aged children, or children in general, have a strong tendency to avoid buildings with elevators and therefore reducing the school aged child count per unit considerably. Finally, the last physical factor affecting the number of school aged children is the issue of traditional neighborhood location. If a site is perceived to simply different from a "traditional" neighborhood the school aged population will be lower per unit type. In estimating the number of students that could be generated from a 200 unit 40B rental scenario we assumed that the design would approximate a traditional garden style development, and that high rise and or atypical site location would not be factors in reducing the regional average of students per unit type.

Therefore based on our assumptions of a mix of apartment types by bedroom number and a garden style apartment design with clubhouse and on site recreational amenities we have estimated the number of school age children as shown in Table 2 below. It should be noted that the number presented is the estimated long term annual average, it will most likely fluctuate 10% above or below the number shown in any given year.

Table 2. School Age Children by Unit Type

Apartment Type	Number	Students / Unit	Students
1 bedroom market	15	0.00	0.00
1 bedroom affordable	5	0.00	0.00
2 bedroom market	105	0.13	13.65
2 bedroom affordable	35	0.40	14.00

3 bedroom market	30	0.60	18.00
3 bedroom affordable.	10	1.00	10.00
Total			**55.65**

We estimate that a 200 unit 40B scenario will generate 56 additional students and of that number approximately 65% or 36 students will attend various grades from preschool to grade 8, and 20 students will attend grades 9 to 12 in any given year. Further, as is common with all apartment developments, the students will attend all the various grade levels K-12 and the composition will change annually, accordingly apartment development very rarely generates consistent demands on any grade level.

To determine the education costs associated with 56 additional students at project build-out we have employed the following estimates in the preparation of Table 3 below: for each additional new teacher we have allotted $60,000 dollars for salary and benefits and to cover services, supplies, and equipment costs we have assigned 10% of total budget or $900 per student. To account for special needs cost, we have assigned $17,000 per special education student, and assumed that 15% of all students will require some form of special needs assistance, said value being an average 10 year cost derived from Massachusetts department of Education data. Additionally, we assumed that additional school bus routes may be needed may be needed and assigned a $40,000 dollar cost per year.

As indicated by Table 2 below the sum of the aforementioned costs represent the total incremental education costs as derived from the five main cost generators associated with the addition of new students to an existing school system. It is assumed that no new school buildings will be required so no prorated capital costs are included.

Table 3. Estimated Annual Education Costs

Number of Students	Number of Teachers (FTE)	Cost of Instruction	Services and Supply (1)	Special Needs Cost (2)	Bus Route Cost (3)	Total Education Cost
56	2.5	$150,000	$38,400	$136,000	$40,000	$364,400

. (1) The services and supplies costs are calculated for 48 traditional students
Special needs costs are calculated and added into the total cost separately.
(2) 8 special need students at $15,000 per student.
(3) Assumes one additional bus route.

Based on the total costs indicated in Table 3 we can determine that the education cost per new residence will be $1,822 dollars ($364,400 divided by 200 total residences) and that the incremental cost per new student is $7,043 ($201,600 total education cost divided by 56 new students).

5.2 General Service Costs (Non-Education Costs)-Residential

In calculating general service costs we examined the operating budget of each municipal department and if the nature of the proposal was determined to have a direct impact in a measurable manner said budget was included as part of general service costs analysis. However, not all departments are impacted. In this instance we can determine no measurable fiscal impact to such items as the Board of Selectman, Assessors, and various other town administrative boards. Similarly, budget line items such as existing debt are not a cost that can be assigned to new development since said debt occurred prior to the proposed development. The proposed uses will pay water fees on a usage basis as do all residential structures in Maynard, and therefore have not been included as an additional incremental cost.

General service cost is driven by population demand, accordingly general service cost is traditionally expressed as a per capita analysis. In this instance the 200 proposed residences have estimated population of approximately 1.8 people per household, a ratio lower than the existing town average of 2.5 people per household. Accordingly, we can anticipate a total development population of 360. Therefore, Table 4 below indicates the total direct and current general service cost based on 2005 dollars. It is assumed that over time the actual dollar amount of said costs will rise but so will the amount of local revenue collected.

As indicated in Table 4 below, where no direct departmental cost impact is anticipated, or where the annual cost to the town is anticipated to be minimal, we have indicated said decision by showing a zero in the fiscal impact column. Column one lists the individual departmental operating budget amount, an amount reflecting direct and current service costs. Column two indicates the FY05 budget by department or indirect cost items. This study does not apply the indirect cost item to the estimated annual service cost unless there is a clear indication of a need for new personnel. In this instance the need for new personnel is in the school department, therefore, said costs are reflected in the school cost analysis and not below in table 4. Column three represents the current per capita cost of direct and current services assuming a current population of 10,500; and column four indicates the cost is anticipated to be generated by the residential scenario. The values in column four are a function of 360 full time equivalent residents multiplied by the existing departmental costs per capita.

As noted, all school costs and the employees benefits cost associated with the new school employees is carried in the school cost portion of this report.

Table 4 General Service Impact by Department

Department	FY05 Budget	Per Capita	$ Impact
Gen. Government	$761,710	$72.54	$26,144
Elections	$27,704	$2.35	$846
Town Clerk	$84,870	$8.08	$368
Police	$1,740,895	$165.80	$59,688
Fire	$1,505,511	$147.67	$53,161
Inspections et al	$1,750	$00.17	$61
Dog Officer	$29,014	$2.76	$994
Forestry	$55,781	$5.31	$1,912
DPW / Snow and Ice	$677,692	$63.98	$0 (2)
Street Lighting.	$135,000	$12.86	$4,558
Health/ et al.	$93,232	$8.88	$3,197
Animal/Mosquito	$16,316	$1.55	$558
Trash	$720,849	$68.65	$24,714
Council on Aging	$69,671	$6.64	$2,390
Veterans	$4,150	$0.40	$144
Library	$355,442	$33.85	$12,186
Recreation	$28,671	$2.73	$983
Existing Debt	$3,172,152	$3.02.10	$0
Retirement (1)	$1,153,046	$109.57	$0
Unemployment (1)	$60,000	$57.14	$0
Health Insurance (1)	$2,400,000	$288.57	$0
Medicare (1)	$125,000	$11.90	$0
Insurance (1)	$195,000	$18.57	$0
Telephone	$29,000	$2.76	$994
Audit	$20,000	$1.90	$0
Total			**$192,560**

1. Carried for school estimated 3 new school instructors in section 5.1
2. All interior or road maintenance, plowing etc, privately maintained.

Given the scenarios estimated population of 360, the annual total general service cost, as indicated by the Table 4 above, is $192,560. However, as noted earlier, departmental operating budgets also service non-residential uses (commercial, industrial and municipal land uses) and in Maynard non-residential general service cost was determined to be not more than 7% of total operational costs) determined by using the proportional valuation method from the Handbook of Fiscal Impact by Burchell and Listokin. Therefore, to reflect a more accurate residential service cost the gross service cost was reduced by 7% to $179,100 generating a $895 service cost per unit.

As shown in Table 5 below, by adding the average school cost and general service cost per unit we can derive a service cost per unit and a total service cost for the entire 40B scenario in 2005 dollars.

Table 5 Projected Municipal Service Costs

Number of Residences	Education Cost per Unit	Non-education Cost per Unit	Total Service Cost per Unit	Total Annual Service Cost
200	$1,822	$895	$2,717	$543,400

As shown in Table 5 above, the average service cost per proposed residence is $2,717 or the total annual service cost of $543,000 divided by 200 units.

6.0 Revenue Sources and Cost to Revenue Ratio for Residential Use

The tax revenue derived from 200 apartment units is based on the income method of assessment a procedure that uses the annual gross rent to drive a taxable value given allowances for vacancy, operations and maintenance. The following factors were used to derive the taxable value of the 40B scenario.

- Rent, One Bedroom Market $1,000
- Rent, One Bedroom Affordable $750
- Rent, Two Bedroom Market $1,200
- Rent, Two Bedroom Affordable $1,000
- Rent, Three Bedroom Market $1,500
- Rent , Three Bedroom Affordable $1,200
- 5% vacancy rate
- 25% operations and maintenance deduction from gross rent
- Cap rate of 10.3

Using the above rents and a unit mix of 10% one bedroom, 70% two bedroom and 20% three bedroom yields a property assessment of approximately 16 million dollars or a taxable value of $80,000 per unit (market and affordable combined).

Applying the estimated assessed value to the current residential tax rate of $13.16 yields an annual property tax of $210,560 or $1,053 per unit. In addition to property taxes we estimate that the 200 units will generate 1.6 vehicles per unit or 320 cars. Using an average of $90 per vehicle for excise tax yields an additional $29,000 in taxes, bringing the total gross taxes yield to $240,000 or $1,200 per unit

Table 6 below, illustrates the potential revenue sources that are associated with the proposal. In this instance in addition to the traditional property taxes, we have examined excise taxes/local receipts, and the potential for Chapter 70 foundation education state aid. The far right column of Table 6 indicates the cost to revenue ratio for the average unit and the proposal as a whole. This ratio represents the average annual fiscal profile or the percentage of every revenue dollar received that is needed to cover all service costs. It serves as a fiscal shorthand to indicate the order of magnitude of the fiscal gain or loss.

Table 6 Service Cost to Revenue Ratio

40B Rental Scenario	Property. Tax per Average unit	State Aid(1)	Excise Taxes(2)	Average Total Revenue per Unit	Gross Service Cost per Unit	Cost to Revenue Ratio
200 Residences	$1,200	$0	$144	$1,344	$2,717	2.02

1. We determined that for the 28 additional students, the nature of the state aid formula is such that it will generate no additional Chapter 70 education aid.
2. Assumes 1.6 vehicles per unit or 320 vehicles registered on site, an average excise tax of $90 per vehicle, $28,800 or $179 per unit. Additional revenue from local receipts such as fees, fines, and licenses will likely occur per unit. These local receipts comprise almost 10% of local revenues.. However, items such as excise tax have already been accounted and other items are not necessarily "generated " by new growth. Thus the total for this category is $179

A 200 unit rental 40b scenario has a negative cost to revenue ratio of 2.02 and generates a net negative fiscal loss of $275,000 per year i.e. it will cost the Town $2.02 in service cost for every $1.00 dollar received.

7.0 A 200 Unit Condominium as a 40B

Assuming the same bedroom mix for a 200 unit 40B as described in Sections 2 through 6 above but by altering the scenario to assume condominium ownership results in a significantly different the net fiscal outcome. Specifically, the method of assessment

changes from the income method to full and fair market value and further the number of school aged children will decline by approximately 15% per unit type (a total of 48 students), thereby lowering total school costs. To estimate total assessed value using the full and fair market approach we assumed the average market sale price per square foot to be $215 per foot, for an 800 square foot one bedroom unit, a 1,050 square foot two bedroom unit, and a 1,300 square foot three bedroom unit. Accordingly we generated the following the following sales prices:

- One Bedroom Market $172,000
- One bedroom Affordable $135,000
- Two Bedroom Market $226,000
- Two Bedroom Affordable $150,000
- Three bedroom Market $280,000
- Three bedroom Affordable $160,000

Using the above sales values and assuming the total assessed valuation is 42.5 million dollars yields an annual tax of $559,000. Adding the excise tax component of $35,500 yields annual gross revenue of approximately $595,000.

The condominium option will also result in 8 fewer school aged children as compared to the rental scenario, a total of 48. The decline in the number of students will reduce anticipated annual school costs by approximately $56,000 to a total of $308,000. A 200 unit condominium has essentially the same general service costs as a rental option i.e. $179,000. Accordingly, the total annual service cost will be approximately $486,000.

Subtracting the $486,000 in total costs from the estimated $595,000 in revenue generates a net annual fiscal benefit of $109,000. However, it must be noted that while an apartment development would most likely be at full occupancy within two years of opening, it will most likely take 5 years to sell all 200 condominiums. Therefore, the associated fiscal benefits will be phased over a considerable period of time.

8.0 100 Assisted Living Units and 100 40B Condominium Units

A scenario comprised of a 100 unit assisted living facility and 100 condominium units of which 25% would be affordable under Chapter 40B regulations is another residential scenario that is consistent with market reality.

Assuming the same values and cost factors as noted in the 200 unit scenario, a 100 unit condominium would generate an annual net fiscal benefit of approximately $55,000.

Assessing the fiscal impact of assisted living is more complicated because the method of assigning an annual tax burden. Further, if a non-profit organization built the facility

there would be no revenue generation. However, to examine this option as a best case revenue example we have assumed a private for profit developer.

Assisted living “rents” are a combination of traditional rent with monthly service fees. Accordingly, it is not uncommon for the total monthly “rent” to reach $4,000 per month. Using said “rent” as a basis for determining tax burden is not practical. As a result it has been our experience with five assisted living projects that the initial taxable value is derived from the sum of land value, site improvements and construction costs.

Based on our experience the assisted living units have a taxable value between $110,000 and $130,000 per unit. For the purposes of this analysis we are assuming a per unit taxable value of $120,000 and accordingly for a 100 unit facility a total assessed value of $12,000,000. At said value the proposal will generate approximately $158,000 in taxes. Since few residents will have cars no excise tax has been computed.

Against the $158,000 in revenue we assume the estimated 100 residents will generate general service costs. The age characteristics of the residents will reduce general service demand per resident, but to be conservative in an analysis where the particulars of an assisted living project are not know, we have assigned the $895 per capita cost, as applied to the apartment residents reviewed earlier in this report. Therefore, conservatively an assisted living facility could generate $90,000 in costs per year against $158,000 in revenue creating a positive fiscal benefit of $68,000 per year.

Combining the assisted living and the 100 unit 40b condominium produces a development scenario with a net positive fiscal benefit of $123,000 per year.

Appendix 1: Housing the Commonwealth's School Aged Children Citizens Housing and Planning Association (CHAPA)

Due to the size and format of the above noted study, a copy has been submitted as an attachment with this report. Please note the range of student generation rates by apartment type and the factors impacting student generation as provided in the summary introduction.

About the Author

John W. Connery
Connery Associates
Principal

Education: Master of City Planning
Ohio State University 1971

Bachelor of Arts
Boston University 1969

Experience:
Mr. Connery has 34 years of community planning experience. He has worked in the Mid West and for the past 31 years in New England. As founding principal of Connery Associates in 1980, he has had over 200 municipal and private clients. Mr. Connery has developed an expertise in municipal zoning, fiscal impact analysis, and project permitting. His professional assignments have included numerous downtown redevelopment projects, community master plans, zoning studies, and cost of development / fiscal impact studies.

Most recently he prepared the Cost of Development Studies for Leominster and Shrewsbury Massachusetts in partnership with Community Opportunities Group (COG). Working with Goody Clancy and Associates he recently completed and had adopted the Zoning Plan for Eastern Cambridge. Mr. Connery's current private sector projects include various commercial fiscal impact studies in Massachusetts including the expansion of Mashpee Commons, the Natick Mall, and life style shopping centers in Reading and Burlington. He is also preparing a fiscal impact studies for various 40B and traditional residential developments; and he is currently preparing comprehensive zoning amendments for Chatham, Lynn, Watertown, and Malden, and Melrose Massachusetts.

With Judi Barrett (principal author) of Community Opportunities Group he has assisted in the development of a 42 community case study regarding the relationship of school aged children and multi-family hosing and the resulting fiscal impacts.
Mr. Connery has also taught one-semester courses in urban planning at the University of Massachusetts at Boston and at Boston University, and has been a guest lecturer at both Harvard and Tufts University Graduate Schools on a number of occasions. He has been employed as an expert land use and zoning witness before both the Land Court and Superior Court for both public and private clients. He is a past president of the

Massachusetts Consulting Planners Association and an active non-professional member of the American Institute of Archaeologists.

Telephone 781 665 8130 Fax 781 665 5864
E-mail: John Connery@comcast.net